

Application Serial No.: 10/674,013
Amendment and Response to March 23, 2006 Non-Final Office Action

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 15, and 17 – 23 are in the application. Claims 1, 14, 19, 21, 22, and 23 are currently amended; claims 7 and 16 are canceled; and claims 2 – 6, 8 – 13, 15, 17, 18, and 20 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof. Claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 are the independent claims herein.

Claims 1, 22, and 23 are currently amended to incorporate aspects of the previous claim 7. Claim 14 is currently amended to incorporate aspects of the previous claim 16. Accordingly, no new matter is added to the application as a result of the amendments submitted herewith.

Reconsideration and further examination of the application are respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Office Action stated that Cite Nos. I and K on the information disclosure statement, I.D.S., filed 09/29/03 have not been considered as to their merits because the document numbers do not match the listed applicant named. In reply thereto, Applicant submits herewith a supplemental I.D.S. that corrects the typographical error of the I.D.S. filed 09/29/03.

Applicant respectfully requests the entry and consideration of the items listed on the supplemental I.D.S. submitted herewith.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contained only 17 words. In reply thereto, a replacement Abstract is submitted for entry and consideration in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that the replacement Abstract overcomes the objection of record.

Application Serial No.: 10/674,013
Amendment and Response to March 23, 2006 Non-Final Office Action

Accordingly, Applicant requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the abstract.

Also, the specification has been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, by way of an amendment submitted herewith. In particular, Applicant has deleted the repeated "that", as indicated in the replacement paragraph.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the Specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 19 and 21 were objected to for including informalities. In reply thereto, claims 19 and 20 have been amended per the suggestions of the Examiner to overcome the objection.

Accordingly, Applicant requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 19 and 20.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101

Claims 1 – 6 and 10 – 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In reply, claims 1, 22, and 23 are currently amended to include aspects of the previous claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 2 – 6 and 10 – 13 depending from claim 1 and claims 22 and 23 overcome the rejection of record under 35 USC 101. Also, claim 14 is currently amended to include aspects of the previous claim 16.

Accordingly, Applicant requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 6 and 10 – 23 under 35 USC 101.

Application Serial No.: 10/674,013
Amendment and Response to March 23, 2006 Non-Final Office Action

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1 – 11, 13 – 18 and 21 – 23 were rejected as being anticipated by Yoakum et al., US 6,658,095 (hereinafter Yoakum). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, Applicant respectfully notes that claim 1 relates to a method that includes configuring a first device as an associated device in a system where the first device is not registered with the system, and receiving information regarding a second device from a device management component, the second device being registered with the system. Clearly, the claimed first device is an associated device that is not registered with a system and a second device is registered with the system. Applicant notes that support for the amendment of claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 to include the clarification that the first device associated with the system is not registered with the system may be found in the specification (at least) at paragraph [0013], lines 9 – 11 (U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. 2005/0071361 A1 corresponding to the present application). As explained in reference with some embodiments in the specification, the claimed invention may advantageously maintain information regarding both (1) registered devices and (2) devices associated but not registered with a system.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited and relied upon Yoakum does not disclose or suggest, at least, the claimed first device associated with the system but not registered with the system and a second device that is registered with the system.

In contrast to claims 1, 14, 22, and 23, Yoakum discloses devices that users and the devices associated with a user are registered with the system(s) therein. In particular, Yoakum discloses "[T]he presence system 20 will accept those subscriptions as well as register participating users and their associated devices." (see Yoakum, col. 4, ln. 47 – 49). Thus, it is clear that Yoakum discloses (*i.e., teaches*) registering a user and registering the devices associated with the user.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited and relied upon Yoakum does not disclose that for which it was cited and relied upon for disclosing. In particular,

Application Serial No.: 10/674,013
Amendment and Response to March 23, 2006 Non-Final Office Action

Yoakum fails to disclose each and every aspect of claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 as is required for a proper and sufficient rejection of anticipation under 35 USC 102(e).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 are patentable over Yoakum under 35 USC 102(e) for at least the reasons stated hereinabove. Claims 2 – 6, 8 – 11 and 13 depend from claim 1 and claims 15, 17, and 18 depend from claim 14. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 – 6, 8 – 11, 13 and 15, 17, 18 are also patentable over Yoakum under 35 USC 102(e) for at least depending from patentable base claims 1 and 14, respectively. Therefore, the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 6, 8 – 11, 13 – 15, 17, 18, and 21 -23 are respectfully requested, as well as the allowance of same.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 12 and 19 – 20 were as being unpatentable over Yoakum in view of “SIP (Session Initiation Protocol) in Enterprise-Class IP Telephone Networks”, White Paper, Communication without boundaries, 2002, Avaya Inc. (hereinafter Avaya”), cited by applicant. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 12 depends from claim 1 and claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 14. Inasmuch as the cited and relied upon Yoakum fails to disclose or suggest each and every aspect of claims 1 and 14 as described in detail hereinabove, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Yoakum with Avaya does not render claims 12 and 19 – 20 obvious under 35 USC 103(a). In particular, the cited and relied upon Avaya does not rectify the deficiencies of Yoakum.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12 and 19 – 20 are patentable over Yoakum and Avaya 35 USC 103(a) for at least the reasons stated hereinabove. Therefore, the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 12 and 19 – 20 are respectfully requested, as well as the allowance of same.


Application Serial No.: 10/674,013
Amendment and Response to March 23, 2006 Non-Final Office Action

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (650) 694-5339.

Respectfully submitted,

June 22, 2006
Date


David D. Chung
Registration No. 38,409
(650) 694-5339

SIEMENS CORPORATION
Customer Number: 28524
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Department
Telephone: 732-321-3026